REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action (hereinafter "the Action") dated May 4, 2006. The above-identified patent application was filed February 5, 2004 with claims 1-25. A restriction requirement was issued in which the Examiner identified a plurality of inventions. Claims 1-11 were elected, and claims 12-25 were withdrawn. An office action was issued September 29, 2005. A response was made in which claims 26-39 were added. A Final Office Action was issued dated May 4, 2006.

Claims 1-11 and 26-39 were pending in this application and claims 12-25 have been previously withdrawn. Claims 1 and 29 have been amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Examiner. Claims 5, 27, 31, 37 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice. In view of the arguments set forth below, claims 1-4, 6-11, 26, 28-30, 32-36 and 38 are allowable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance.

L OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, the Examiner stated that the drawings must show every feature of the invention. The Examiner stated that the stablization device in claims 5 and 31 and the pressure sensor in claim 37 must be shown in the drawings or canceled from the claims. Claims 5, 31, and 37 have been

{WP335834;1}

U.S. Serial No. 10/772,479 Amendment Dated September 20, 2006 Response To Office Action Dated May 4, 2006

SEP 2 0 2006

canceled without prejudice. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection.

II. SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner objected to claims 27 and 39 in which a compression ejection spring is claimed as being positioned in the deployment chamber.

Claims 27 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection.

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 27, and 29 for a list of informalities. The Examiner also objected to claim 29 for use of "the mooring line module" rather than "anchor." Claims 1 and 29 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations, and claim 27 has been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection.

{WP335834;1}

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 27 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written requirement. Claims 27 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-11 and 26-39 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner wrote that use of the phrase "above a bottom" renders the claim indefinite. Claims 1 and 29 have been amended to change the word "bottom" to "a sea floor." Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 29 because of the use of the phrase "the autonomous." The Examiner wrote that insertion of the phrase "mooring device" after autonomous overcomes the rejection. Claims 1 and 29 have been amended accordingly. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

VII. PETITION FOR TWO MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME

This is a Petition for a two Month Extension of Time pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136.

Please charge the fee in the amount of \$450.00 for a two (2) month extension of time pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(2) and charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951. A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.

{WP335834,1}

5616596313

T-496 P.21/21 F-804

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 2 0 2006

U.S. Serial No. 10/772,479 Amendment Dated September 20, 2006 Response To Office Action Dated May 4, 2006

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons given above, claims 1-4, 6-11, 26, 28-30, 32-36 and 38 define patentable subject matter and are thus allowable. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

No fees, in addition to the extension of time, are believed due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael K. Dixon

Reg. No. 46,665

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

222 Lakeview Avenue

Suite 400

West Palm Beach, Florida 33401-6183

(561) 653-5000

Attorney Docket No.: 6818-64

{WP335834;1}